

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/667,363	09/23/2003	Claudio Giorda	Q77674	9199
23373 759	90 10/19/2005		EXAM	INER
SUGHRUE M	ION, PLLC	ADDISU, SARA		
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20037			3722	
			DATE MAILED: 10/19/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		E
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/667,363	GIORDA, CLAUDIO
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Sara Addisu	3722
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 Cl after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory p - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IG DATE OF THIS COMMUNION FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a ron. Deriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON statute, cause the application to become AE	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	23 September 2003.	
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑	This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice und	·	•
Disposition of Claims		
 4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the applicate 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction as 	hdrawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exa		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>18 March 2004</u> is/a		
Applicant may not request that any objection to	•	• •
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the control of the control		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docur 2. Certified copies of the priority docur 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a	ments have been received. ments have been received in A priority documents have been ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	application No received in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	A) 🗖 Into a day of	Summany (DTO 412)
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/18/04. 	8) Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- Claims 1, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Straub et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,343,899), in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

Straub et al. teaches a horizontal boring machine for boring cylindrical surfaces having horizontal axis and axially spaced apart from each other, such as the seats for an engine crankshaft in the crankcase of an internal combustion engine ('899, figure 3). AAPA also confirms that Figure 1 of Straub et al.'s invention is a reproduction of Figure 2 of the Instant Application (Specification, page 1, lines 28-29, therefore Straub et al. teaches the structures claimed in claim 1 (i.e. the boring machine including a boring bar driven in rotation by a chuck and carrying at least one cutting bit, driving means for driving rotation of said chuck, means for axially moving the group composed of the chuck and the associated driving means, a counter-bar coupled in rotation head-to-head with said boring bar and driven in rotation by a respective auxiliary chuck, driving means for driving the rotation of the auxiliary chuck in synchronism with the rotation of the

Art Unit: 3722

boring bar, means for axially moving the group composed of said counter-bar and the associated driving means, in synchronism with the axial movement of the boring bar, said boring bar being provided with a device for adjusting the radial position of said at least one cutting bit that is associated therewith) (AAPA, Page 1, line 28-page 3, line 19). Furthermore, Straub et al. teaches counter-bar (46) being provided with radially adjustable cutting bits at which point the coupling would be disposed approximately in the center similar to figure 1 and the counter-bar constitutes auxiliary boring bar ('899, Col. 10, lines 21-38 and Col. 3, lines 20-24).

2. Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Straub et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,343,899), in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) and further in view of Horn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,012,880).

Straub et al. teaches all the elements as set forth in the above rejection.

Regarding claim 4, Straub et al. teaches in figures 3-6, a second embodiment where the boring bar (28) is equipped with axially staggered cutting tools (30a-30e) accommodated in bending tool fixtures (elastically deformable blade) (68) for radial adjustment due to a radial pin (66) {note: regarding claim 4, although AAPA states that ".. an arrangement with multiple cutting bits axially spaced apart from each other on the boring bar is unthinkable, as in this case it would be impossible in practice to make an automatic radial adjustment system for all of the cutting bits carried by the boring bar"

Application/Control Number: 10/667,363

Art Unit: 3722

(AAPA, Page 3, lines 20-28), as mentioned above Straub et al. teaches in figures 3-6, a second embodiment where the boring bar (28) is equipped with axially staggered cutting tools (30a-30e)}.

However, Straub et al. fails to teach the main boring bar and the counter-bar being provided with a pair of diametrically opposed cutting bits. Straub et al. also fails to teach the elastically deformable blade being moved outwardly due to the radial pin engaging against a conical portion of a shaft.

Horn et al. teaches a device for finish machining of bearing bores at crankcases having spindle boxes (1 & 2), a tool bit (11) carried by a resilient tool holder (8) and a diametrically opposed semi-finish tool (15). Horn et al. also teaches a cutting bit (11) being carried near the free end of a resilient tool holder (8) while the opposite end is fixed to the body of the boring bar via screws (9) ('880, figure 1). The resilient tool holder (elastically deformable blade) (8) is moved outwardly due to the radial pin engaging against a conical portion (7) of a shaft sliding inside n axial cavity of a bar.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Straub et al.'s invention such that it includes a diametrically opposed tool, as taught by Horn et al. for the purpose of performing a semi-finish machining ('880, Col. 2, lines 50-51). The modified device of Straub et al. would therefore have a semi-finish tools diametrically opposed to each tool bit (30a-30e), therefore the semi-finish tools would also be axially staggered as are tool bits (30a-30e, '899, figure 4). It would have also been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Straub et al.'s invention such that

Art Unit: 3722

the radial movement of the elastically deformable tool holder is due to the radial pin engaging a conical portion of a shaft, as taught by Horn et al. for the purpose of ensuring that the tool holder and/or the tool will constantly take the desired position. ('880, Col. 1, lines 43-49).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sara Addisu at (571) 272-6082. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer Ashley can be reached on (571) 272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sara Addisu (571)272-6082

BOYER D. ASHLEY PRIMARY EXAMINER